

### United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,479	08/01/2001	Robert Lindsay Mailler	PIZ-1010/00	8160
75	90 12/17/2002			
Ronald W Citkowski			EXAMINER	
	roh Sprinkle Andersor Woodward Avenue Sui	TRAN, DALENA		
Birmingham, MI 48009			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	
			DATE MAIL ED. 12/12/2003	DATE MAIL ED. 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

( ) b	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/830,479	MAILLER, ROBERT LINDSAY
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dalena Tran	3661
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days,  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply on. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 bend will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS statute, cause the application to become ABAN	by be timely filed  O) days will be considered timely.  S from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>01 August 2001</u> .	
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠	This action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice un Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disa	approved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority docu</li> </ol>	ments have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been received in App	lication No
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a second content of the certified copies of the certified copies of the action for a second content of the certified copies of the certified copie</li></ul>	al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dor	•	
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign languag  15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for do	e provisional application has been	n received.
Attachment(s)		,
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	8) 5) Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)



# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trad rk Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO./	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR I	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
CONTROL NO.		PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

6

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

Art Unit: 3661

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-12 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, and 6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (5,987,383) in view of Dano (4,398,195).

As per claim 1, Keller et al. disclose a vehicle guidance apparatus for guiding an agricultural vehicle over a paddock along a number of paths, the paths being offset from each other by a predetermined distance, vehicle including steering means, apparatus including: position determining arranged to generate vehicle position data (see columns 1-2, lines 62-38), and guidance coupled to microprocessor and arranged to aid in guiding vehicle thereby reducing errors (see columns 3-6, lines 2-59). Keller et al. do not disclose data entry facilitating entry of an initial path. However, Dano discloses data entry facilitating entry of an initial path by an operator and a desired offset distance between paths, and processing coupled to position determining and operatively arranged to generate paths based on initial paths, and generating guidance signal indicative of errors in the position of the vehicle relative to one of paths (see columns 5-7, lines 20-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made by combining data entry facilitating entry of an initial path by an

Art Unit: 3661

operator and a desired offset distance between paths, and processing coupled to position determining and operatively arranged to generate paths based on initial paths, and generating guidance signal indicative of errors in the position of the vehicle relative to one of paths for guiding an agricultural vehicle, for example an aircraft, while engaged in pattern flying.

As per claim 2, Keller et al. do not disclose an indication of the direction of vehicle relative to a path closest to vehicle. However, Dano discloses microprocessor is further operatively arranged to provide an indication of the direction of vehicle relative to a path closest to vehicle (see columns 9-10, lines 30-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. by combining microprocessor is further operatively arranged to provide an indication of the direction of vehicle relative to a path closest to vehicle for easy to set up a baseline and the aircraft flies over the entire predetermined flight pattern base on the baseline.

As per claim 3, Dano discloses paths are straight parallel lines (see columns 3-5, lines 61-19).

As per claim 6, Keller et al. disclose guidance comprises a human interface for converting guidance signal to a format indicating error to a human operator of vehicle (see columns 7-8, lines 17-29).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (5,987,383), and Dano (4,398,195) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Keller et al. (6,087,984).

As per claim 4, Keller et al. ('383), and Dano do not disclose path are concentric polygons. However, Keller et al. ('984) disclose path are concentric polygons (see the abstract;

Art Unit: 3661

and columns 2-3, lines 63-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383) by combining path are concentric polygons to for efficiently dispensing chemicals or crop to variety of agricultural fields geometry.

5. Claims 5,7, and 10-12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (5,987,383), and Dano (4,398,195) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Winslow (6,314,348).

As per claim 5, Keller et al. ('383), and Dano do not disclose a radio modem. However, Winslow discloses position determining includes a satellite based geographical positioning system receiver (see columns 2-3, lines 52-39), and a radio modem operatively receiving positional correction factor data (see columns 4-5, lines 66-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383), and Dano by combining position determining includes a satellite based geographical positioning system receiver, and a radio modem operatively receiving positional correction factor data for accurately guiding an agricultural vehicle over a predetermined path.

As per claim 7, Keller et al. ('383), and Dano do not disclose a controllable steering. However, Winslow discloses guidance comprises a controllable steering coupled to processing and arranged to steer vehicle in a direction reducing error (see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383), and Dano by combining guidance comprises a controllable steering coupled to processing and arranged to steer vehicle in a direction reducing error for guiding the

Art Unit: 3661

vehicle along a desired path to make sure the vehicle go through every area in the path to avoid overlap or the path not go through.

As per claim 10, Winslow discloses controllable steering includes at least one solenoid mechanically coupled to steering, solenoid responsive to guidance signal (see columns 2-3, lines 51-39).

As per claims 11-12, Keller et al. ('383), and Dano do not disclose steerage feedback sensors. However, Winslow discloses steerage feedback sensors operative to generate feedback signals indicative of orientation of steerable wheels or tracks, microprocessor being responsive to steerage feedback signals (see columns 5-8, lines 48-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383), and Dano by combining steerage feedback sensors operative to generate feedback signals indicative of orientation of steerable wheels or tracks, microprocessor being responsive to steerage feedback signals to provide a balance steering wheel to generate a desired correction.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (5,987,383), Dano (4,398,195), and Winslow (6,314,348) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lestradet (4,558,760).

As per claim 8, Keller et al. ('383), and Dano do not disclose relative position. However, Lestradet discloses relative position determining mountable to vehicle, generating positional data signals indicative of the position of vehicle, microprocessor being responsive to positional data signals (see columns 3-6, lines 41-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383), and Dano by combining relative position determining mountable to vehicle, generating positional data signals

Art Unit: 3661

indicative of the position of vehicle, microprocessor being responsive to positional data signals for detecting deviation of the vehicle position relative to a path fixed.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (5,987,383), Dano (4,398,195), Winslow (6,314,348), and Lestradet (4,558,760) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Kyrtsos et al. (5,375,059).

As per claim 9, Keller et al. ('383), Dano, Winslow, and Lestradet do not disclose accelerometers. However, Kyrtsos et al. disclose relative position determining comprises a number of accelerometers (see columns 16-17, lines 54-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Keller et al. ('383), and Dano by combining relative position determining comprises a number of accelerometers for the accurate determination of the agricultural vehicle relative to a path.

#### Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
  - . Reinaud (4,706,773)
  - . Kamimura et al. (5,019,990)
  - . Teach (5,334,987)
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalena Tran whose telephone number is 703-308-8223. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM-5:30PM), off every other Friday.

Art Unit: 3661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on 703-308-3873. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Page 7

/dt

December 11, 2002